

ORIGINAL

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In the Matter of)
)
Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 332)
of the Communications Act)
)
Regulatory Treatment of Mobile Services)

GN Docket No. 93-252

To: The Commission

RECEIVED

JUL 11 1994

REPLY COMMENTS

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THOMAS LUCZAK

Robert H. Schwaninger, Jr.
Brown and Schwaninger
Suite 650
1835 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/223-8837

Dated: July 11, 1994

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

0+4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	ii
Nextel's Earlier Waiver	2
Nextel Would Give Nothing	6
The Equities Are Clearly Against Grant	8
Conclusion	11

SUMMARY

The public interest neither demands nor supports such a proposal and the Commission should wholly reject Nextel's proposal as another self-serving attempt to gain greater advantages within the marketplace. Nextel has a wealth of channels authorized for its vaunted use. Applying the Commission's normal loading standards, Nextel's claim of 5,000 ESMR users merely gives numerical credence to the notion that Nextel's business thus far has been the creation of frequency warehouses in the Country's major markets. That loading figure would justify no more than 72 channels for an analog operator, yet within Los Angeles there are many, many more channels authorized for Nextel's use.

it appears that the Commission was either misled, wrong or simply misinterpreted Nextel's request for waiver. Nextel now claims that it requires what the Commission earlier determined was not needed. Confronted with this miscalculation by Nextel, the Commission has little flexibility to assist Nextel, other than allowing Nextel to deal with the problem as an internal matter, rather than one which requires a rule making proceeding.

Nextel has not even come close to offering just compensation for the concessions it seeks. The Commission may consider the costs which would be paid by Nextel and the terms under which such action might be taken, were this an arms length negotiation, rather than a rule making proceeding. Even Nextel's offer to pay the cost of changing out equipment is illusory. One must presume that the offer does not extend far beyond the cost of new hardware or crystals. The Commission should, then, see the Nextel plan for what it is, a brazen request for special consideration carrying a daunting cost to millions of persons who will receive absolutely no benefit.

The Commission knows that the number of persons to be adversely affected by grant of Nextel's request far outnumber, by multiples of tens, the number which might benefit. The Commission knows that Nextel's proposed service will provide no greater service than that to be provided by PCS or even that following the conversion of cellular service to digital operation. It is clear, therefore, that Nextel has failed dismally to demonstrate that its request would be in the public interest. In fact, Nextel's arguments demonstrate that it is far less concerned with the public interest than in its own private interest.

Grant of this proposal would be favoritism, to assist one telecommunications operator above and beyond the wishes of the rest of the industry and at an extreme cost to that industry. Nextel's failure to design and operate its system in accord with sound engineering practices should be of no more concern to the Commission than the success or failure of each individual mom and pop system.

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTIONS 3(N))	GN DOCKET NO. 93-252
AND 332 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT)	
)	
Regulatory Treatment of Mobile Services)	

To: The Commission

REPLY COMMENTS

Thomas Luczak (Luczak) hereby submits comments in reply within the above captioned proceeding. Luczak is an operator of an analog SMR system within the State of California and within one of Nextel Communications, Inc.'s (Nextel) prime ESMR market areas, the greater Los Angeles area. Accordingly, Luczak's interest in the outcome of this proceeding and his ability to make meaningful comment are established.

Luczak's hereby opposes the proposals lofted by Nextel within this proceeding and as counterproductive to the operation and growth of analog SMR operators' systems and as wholly unjustified. The public interest neither demands nor supports such a proposal and the Commission should wholly reject Nextel's proposal as another self-serving attempt to gain greater advantages within the marketplace.

Nextel's Earlier Waiver

Not content with its earlier granted waiver which allowed it to avoid loading and construction deadlines, providing one of the greatest competitive advantages ever bestowed on a single entity, Nextel has lumbered back to the well, again seeking to slake its gargantuan thirst.

Perhaps the most surprising element of Nextel's proposal is that it no longer considers itself to be an SMR. Now, to believe Nextel, it has metamorphosed into something else. It is a paging/cellular/digital/mobile data/slam-bang All American thingamajig. And whatever it is or might become theoretically will compete directly with cellular and PCS operators. That is, if it can just have a few moments of the Commission's time to weave another tale of bright lights and buzzing megahertz that await on the horizon, as soon as it can get those pesky, smaller SMR operators out of its hair.¹

If the foregoing sounds a bit harsh or flip, it is a logical reaction to Nextel's attempt to gain more than logic and law allows. Within the Los Angeles area, there has long been persons on waiting lists hoping against all hope or reason that an SMR channel might become available to assist them in continuing the growth of their businesses. With

¹ Despite the obviously pejorative nature of Nextel's opinion of analog SMR operations, Nextel should take note that analog SMR operators serve more subscribers at cost-effective pricing, to an every increasing market share, than Nextel presently enjoys for its ESMR service. Accordingly, it appears that the public prefers what it has to what Nextel might be promising.

burgeoning loading and "busy" outs being the rule on many systems, there is now little relief in sight to keep up with channel demand. Yet, amid all of the scratching and digging for additional spectrum by analog SMR operators calmly sits Nextel, clutching its waiver.

Nextel has a wealth of channels authorized for its vaunted use. More than any analog operator might dream of or hope ever to acquire. Some, admittedly, were purchased from existing analog operators at what must be presumed to have been fair market value. Others were snatched up in bunches, following a flow of Nextel's applications for a dozen here and twenty there. In more cases than not, Nextel is an absentee owner of its spectrum, having failed to construct the bulk of the channels for which it is authorized, allowing that spectrum to lie fallow until it could find the investors to finance its hubris. Were an analog SMR operator to attempt what Nextel sees as "standard operating practice" the Commission would fine that operator into bankruptcy for failing to provide service to the public. But Nextel has its free pass.

Applying the Commission's normal loading standards, Nextel's claim of 5,000 ESMR users merely gives numerical credence to the notion that Nextel's business thus far has been the creation of frequency warehouses in the Country's major markets. That loading figure would justify no more than 72 channels for an analog operator, yet within Los Angeles there are many, many more channels authorized for Nextel's use. It may be noted that these paltry loading figures are the sum total of Nextel's success in serving the

public following the three years since grant of Nextel's waiver.² The Commission may also note that there are analog operators within the Los Angeles area serving more members of the public on fewer than 70 channels.

So, if as it appears Nextel has not spent the last three years building a viable system which will serve the millions of customers it claims are anxiously awaiting ESMR service, what then has Nextel been up to? According to its comments, it has been financing the development of the radio art to deliver the service which it promised within its request for waiver. But this statement cannot be true.

The Commission determined in its Memorandum Opinion and Order (MO&O), granting Nextel's *nee* Fleet Call, Inc.'s waiver that Nextel's claims and promises did not require any reallocation of spectrum. In effect, Nextel's system could deliver its services without the need to provide it additional protection from new or existing analog SMR operations. The existing protections of channel exclusivity for trunked operations would be sufficient. However, in accord with Nextel's latest comments, it appears that the Commission was either misled, wrong or simply misinterpreted Nextel's request for

² Luczak recognizes that the majority of Nextel's customers continue to receive analog SMR dispatch services. However, since Nextel bases its comments on the level of services it presently provides for its ESMR customers, it is appropriate that all evaluation of Nextel's comments be based on that number as it applies to Nextel's demand for greater privilege. Nextel already possesses all necessary authority to continue to provide analog dispatch services.

waiver. Nextel now claims that it requires what the Commission earlier determined was not needed.

Luczak respectfully suggests that the Commission was accurately interpreting Nextel's request for waiver in its MO&O. A review of the record would undoubtedly show that Nextel's request never included a proposal to reallocate spectrum or create exclusive territories within MTAs. Yet, Nextel now pleads for such concessions to enable its fledgling system to work. It, therefore, appears that the system that Nextel claims to have introduced to the market is not the same as the one which it claimed it would bring forth pursuant to its request for waiver -- or that Nextel grossly miscalculated its needs in its prior request.

Confronted with this miscalculation by Nextel, the Commission has little flexibility to assist Nextel, other than allowing Nextel to deal with the problem as an internal matter, rather than one which requires a rule making proceeding. To do otherwise would provide Nextel with assistance which is not claimed to be needed by any other ESMR operator, not desired by potentially adversely affected analog SMR operators, and cannot be legally or economically justified. In sum, Nextel has requested far too much in its proposal and its request will provide no benefit to other operators or their millions of subscribers.

Nextel Would Give Nothing

If the Commission reviews carefully Nextel's proposal, the Commission will determine that Nextel's offer is extremely one-sided. It would ask that the Commission, in effect, create monopoly control of ESMR operation in many major markets and the cost to the new monopoly would be little more than a pocket full of crystals. Nextel has not even come close to offering just compensation for the concessions it seeks.

The Commission may consider the following costs which would be paid by Nextel and the terms under which such action might be taken, were this an arms length negotiation, rather than a rule making proceeding.

1. Nextel would need to pay to retune all equipment and replace all equipment which was not capable of being retuned.
2. Nextel would pay for any loss of service from all affected repeaters, including loss of revenue from subscribers.
3. Nextel would pay subscribers for all loss of time and resources expended in participating in any frequency exchange.
4. Nextel would pay for all loss of efficiency within systems employing combiners where the new frequency separation following the exchange might adversely affect operations.
5. Nextel would pay the Commission for all personnel time expended in analyzing the hundreds or thousands of licenses which would be involved in any frequency exchange or creation of exclusive territories.
6. Nextel would pay for all legal costs in making new applications to the Commission for any and all modifications in authority to record frequency changes.
7. Nextel would pay for all legal costs arising out of renegotiation of site lease agreements, which often are frequency specific, including any

increases in rental charges arising out of such negotiations; or any loss of site leases arising out of same.

8. Nextel would pay to perform intermodulation studies at all locations where frequency exchanges might occur, to determine whether the replacement would cause harmful interference to existing operators and users.

9. Nextel would pay for all loss of business or reputation to business arising out of any adverse customer confidence resulting from a recall of equipment.

10. Nextel would pay all costs arising out of the printing of new service contracts in those instances where the contracts list the frequency upon which the system operates.

11. Nextel would compensate all persons who can demonstrate any loss arising out of substantive changes in short-space agreements, management contracts, options, letters of intent for sale, contracts for sale, modification to pending applications for assignment, and all other matters which rely on the continued authority to operate on identified and defined frequencies.

The above list is far from complete. There are many other costs that will arise from grant of Nextel's proposal and none are truly part of Nextel's offer. Even Nextel's offer to pay the cost of changing out equipment is illusory. One must presume that the offer does not extend far beyond the cost of new hardware or crystals. Some small amount of labor costs are also assumed.³ But that amount will not approach the enormous costs which an operator will absorb if forced to accommodate Nextel's plan.

³ It is doubtful that Nextel would actually perform the change of frequency within subscriber equipment and any offer to do so should be rejected. Nextel competes directly with SMR operators who are not likely to want to identify each of their subscribers to a well financed competitor.

The Commission should, then, see the Nextel plan for what it is, a brazen request for special consideration carrying a daunting cost to millions of persons who will receive absolutely no benefit. In fact, Nextel's only true offer in exchange for grant of its proposal is to bring its service to the public. The Commission already received that promise three years ago when it granted Nextel's waiver. The Commission and the public should not be made to pay twice for the same goods.

The Equities Are Clearly Against Grant

Nextel claims that it serves 5,000 ESMR customers. The Commission knows that the number of persons to be adversely affected by grant of Nextel's request far outnumber, by multiples of tens, the number which might benefit. Nextel claims that its service is so new and wonderful that it deserves this consideration. The Commission knows that Nextel's proposed service will provide no greater service than that to be provided by PCS or even that following the conversion of cellular service to digital operation. Nextel states, in effect, that its great investment in ESMR justifies this additional consideration. However, the Commission knows that it has no obligation to protect the investments of telecommunications entities and that each are to be allowed an opportunity to succeed or fail on its own merits. Accordingly, none of Nextel's excuses arise to the level of logical or legal justification for its proposal.

It is clear, therefore, that Nextel has failed dismally to demonstrate that its request would be in the public interest. In fact, Nextel's arguments demonstrate that it is far less

concerned with the public interest than in its own private interest. Its private interest served as a basis for its request for waiver of the Commission's Rules, but such self-serving bases do not begin to approach the evidentiary showing necessary to justify the disruption of a mature industry.

Nor should the Commission be placed in a position which might appear to make it the tool of a single company. Nextel's proposal has not been supported by any other entity up until now. Grant of this proposal would be favoritism, to assist one telecommunications operator above and beyond the wishes of the rest of the industry and at an extreme cost to that industry. Although Luczak is certain that no such special treatment has been considered by the Commission and none will be offered, the appearance of such action becomes of paramount importance to an agency which relies heavily on the cooperation of the regulated industry.

It is not clear whether Nextel's proposal is motivated by desperation, hubris, arrogance or ignorance, or a combination thereof. It could well be that Nextel's system is so fraught with technical problems that it cannot hope to operate efficiently or even close to the level which it has promised for the last three years during the building of its empire.⁴ More's the pity. But Nextel's failure to design and operate its system in accord

⁴ That Nextel has failed to employ a digital receiver which is invulnerable to adjacent channel interference does not create ample justification for industry-wide accommodation for its error.

with sound engineering practices should be of no more concern to the Commission than the success or failure of each individual mom and pop system.

Companies come and go in accord with their management's ability to read the needs of the market and to timely provide a sound product to meet those needs. America has grown and prospered following the passing from the stage of RKO General's broadcast properties, Graphic Scanning Corporation, and soon Sigma Telecommunications, Inc. If it is Nextel's fate that it too pass from this mortal coil, then the Country and the telecommunications industry will note its passing and continue on, still vibrant and dynamic. That is the nature of business. And nothing which the Commission might do should upset or intrude upon the nature of that business.

It is, therefore, clear that Nextel lacks any justification for its proposal. It has already received a significant advantage in the grant of its waiver and, by its admissions, it squandered that opportunity. But like a parent must be firm to avoid spoiling a child, the Commission must resist Nextel's latest demands, to avoid the creation of a pet -- with an appetite which might devour the integrity of the Commission itself.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Luczak hereby respectfully requests that the Commission deny Nextel's proposals and wish Nextel well in its future attempts to get its system on line.

Respectfully submitted,
THOMAS LUCZAK

By


Robert H. Schwaninger, Jr.

Brown and Schwaninger
Suite 650
1835 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/223-8837

Dated: July 11, 1994

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Nakia M. Marks, hereby certify that on this 11th day of July, 1994, I caused a copy of the attached Reply Comments to be served by hand delivery or first-class mail, postage prepaid to the following:

Chairman Reed E. Hundt
Federal Communications Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner H. Quello
Federal Communications Commission
Room 802
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Andrew C. Barrett
Federal Communications Commission
Room 826
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Susan P. Ness
Federal Communications Commission
Room 832
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Rachalle B. Chong
Federal Communications Commission
Room 844
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Blair Levin
Federal Communications Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Karen Brinkmann
Federal Communications Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Rudolfo M. Baca
Federal Communications Commission
Room 802
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Byron Marchant
Federal Communications Commission
Room 826
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Jan Mago
Federal Communications Commission
Room 844
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Rosalind K. Allen
Federal Communications Commission
Room 832
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ralph A. Haller
Chief, Private Radio Bureau
Room 5002
Federal Communications Commission
2025 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Beverly G. Baker
Private Radio Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5002
2025 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

David Furth
Private Radio Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5202
2025 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ron Netro
Private Radio Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5002
2025 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

A. Richard Metzger, Jr.
Acting Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 500
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Gerald Vaughn
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 500
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

John Cimko
Mobile Service Division
Federal Communications Commission
Room 644
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Terry Fishel
Chief, Land Mobile Branch
Licensing Division
Federal Communications Commission
1270 Fairfield Road
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325

Alan R. Shark
President
American Mobile Telecommunications
Association
1150 - 18th Street, NW, Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20036

Elizabeth Sachs
Lukas, McGowan, Nace &
Gutierrez
Suite 700
1819 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mary Broomer
Mike Kennedy
Joe Vestel
Motorola, Inc.
Suite 400
1350 Eye Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Mark Crosby
ITA, Inc.
Suite 500
1110 N. Glebe Road
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Alan Tilles
Meyer, Faller, Weisman &
Rosenberg
Suite 380
4400 Jennifer Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20015

Michael Carper
General Counsel
OneComm
Suite 500
4643 S. Ulster Street
Denver, Colorado 80237

Bill Dekay
Dial Page
Suite 700
301 College Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29603-0767

Russell H. Fox
Gardner, Carton & Douglas
Suite 900, East Tower
1301 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Willard K. Shaw
Mobile Radio Communications
2226 Vista Valley Lane
Vista, California 92084

Carole C. Harris Christine M. Gill
Tamara Y. Davis Keller & Heckman
1001 G Street, NW
Suite 500 West
Washington, DC 20001

David C. Jatlow
Young & Jatlow
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Donald M. Mukai
Jeffrey S. Bork
U.S. West, Inc.
1020 19th Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Paul J. Feldman
Fletcher, Heald & Heldreth
11th Floor
1300 North 17th Street
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

Jeffery L. Sheldon
Sean A. Stokes
1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1140
Washington, DC 20036

Brian Kidney
Pamela Riley
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94108

Kenneth G. Starling
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

David A. Gross
Kathleen D. Abernathy
1818 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

John T. Scott, III
Charon J. Harris
William D. Wallace
Crowell & Moring
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Philip L. Spector
Susan E. Ryan
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison
1615 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

William J. Balcerski
Edward R. Wholi
120 Bloomingdale Road
White Plains, New York 10605

Leslie A. Taylor
Leslie Taylor Associates
6800 Carlynn Court
Bethesda, MD 20817

Robert S. Foosaner, VP
Nextel Communication, Inc.
800 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1001
Washington, DC 20006

Norman P. Leventhal
Raul R. Rodriguez
Levental, Senter & Lerman
2000 K Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006

Gail L. Polivy
1850 M Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036

Susan H-R. Jones
Gardner, Carton & Douglas
1301 K Street, NW
Suite 900 East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

Cathlen A. Massey
McCaw Cellular, Inc.
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW
4th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

William J. Franklin, Chartered
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006

Frederick M. Joyce
Christine McLaughlin
Joyce & Jacobs
2300 M Street, NW
Suite 130
Washington, DC 20037

Fredrick J. Day
1110 N Glebe Road
Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201

Thomas J. Caey
Jay L. Birnbaum
Timothy R. Robinson
Skaddon, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
1440 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Wayne Black
Dorothy E. Cukier
Keller & Heckman
1001 G Street, NW
Suite 500 West
Washington DC 20001

Jay C. Keithley
Leon Kestenbaum
Sprint Corp.
1850 Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036

Kevin Gallaher
8725 Higgins Road
Chicago, IL 60631

Craig T. Smith
P.O. Box 11315
Kansas City, MO 64112

Harold C. Davis
Smartlink Development LP
1269 S. Broad Street
Willingford, Connecticut 06492

W. Bruce Hanks, President
Century Cellunet, Inc.
100 Century Park Avenue
Monroe, LA 71203

Henry Goldberg
Jonathan L. Wiener
Daniel S. Goldberg
Goldberg, Godles, Wiener & Wright
1229 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

J. Barclay Jones, VP
American Personal Communication
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Mark J. O'Conner
Mark J. Tanber
Piper & Marbury
1200 19th Street, NW
7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Jim O. Elewellyn
William B. Barfield
1155 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3610

Charles P. Featherstun
David G. Richards
1133 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Robert A. Mazer
Nixon, Hargrave, Devans & Doyle
One Thomas Circle, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005

William R. Miller
Russ Miller Rental
3620 Byers Avenue
Fort Worth, TX 76107

Michael Hirsch,
VP External Affairs
Geotek Communications
1200 19th Street, NW #607
Washington, DC 20036

Robin G. Nietert
Scott C. Cinnarion
Brown, Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered
1920 N Street, NW
Suite 660
Washington, DC 20036

Raymond G. Bender, Jr.
J.G. Harrington
Leonard J. Kennedy
Laura H. Phillips
Richard S. Dennins
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1255 23rd Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20037

Gerald S. McGowan
George L. Lyon, Jr.
Thomas Gutierrez
David A. LaFuria
Lukas, McGowan, Nace & Gutierrez,
Chartered
1819 H Street, NW
7th Floor
Washington, DC 20006

Stephen G. Kraskin
Cardessa D. Bennet
Karskin & Associates
2120 L Street, NW
Suite 810
Washington, DC 20037

Richard Rubin
Fleishmann & Walsh
1400 16th Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

Elliot J. Greenwald
Howard C. Griboff
Fisher, Wayland, Cooper, Leader, &
Zaragusa, L.L.P.
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

Lon C. Levin, VP
American Mobile Satellite Corp.
10802 Parkridge Boulevard
Reston, VA 22091

Andrea S. Miano
Reed, Smith, Swaw & McClay
1200 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas J. Keller
Verner, Lipphert, Bernhard, McPherson &
Hand, Chartered
901 15th Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005

Robert Fay
Police Emergency Radio Service, Inc.
82 Herbert Street
Franinham, MA 01701

Alan C. Campbell, Pres.
FCBA
1722 Eye Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006

Donald J. Elardo
Larry A. Blooser
Gregory F. Intoccia
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20006

Frank Michael Panek
2000 W Ameritech Center Drive
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

James Bradford Ramsay
102 Commerce Commission Building
Constitution Avenue, & 12th St., NW
Washington, DC 20423

Daryl L. Avery
DC Public Service Commission
450 5th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

David A. Reams, Pres.
Grand Broadcasting
P.O. Box 502
Perryburg, OH 43552

Anne P. Jones
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC

Edward R. Wholl
120 Bloomingdale Road
White Plains, NY 10605

Albert H. Kramer
Robert F. Aldrich
David B. Jeppsen
Keck, Mahin & Cate
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005-3919

David Cosson
2626 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Martin T. McCul, VP
900 19th Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006

Michael J. Shortley, III
180 South Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14646

Jan M. Reed
Route 5, Box 180-W
Crossville, TN 38555

Terrence P. McGarty
Telmarc Telecommunication
265 Franklin Street
Suite 1102
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Corporate Technology Partners
100 S. Ellsworth Avenue, 9th Floor
San Mateo, CA 94401

Rodney Joyce
Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Ellen S. Levine
CA Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Joel Levy
Cohn & Marks
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas A. Strovoy
Mark Golden
Telocator
1019 19th Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036

Richard M. Tettlebaum
Gurman, Kurtis, Blask & Freedman,
Chartered
1400 16th Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Carl Northrop
Bryan Cave
700 13th Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005

Koteen & Naftalin
1150 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, DC 20036

W. Bruce Hanks, Pres.
Century Cellunet, Inc.
100 Century Park Avenue
Monroe, LA 71203

Linda Sadler
Rockwell International Corp.
1745 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

G.A. Gorman
North Pittsburgh Telephone Company
4008 Gibsonia Road
Gibsonia, PA 15044-9311

Penny Rubin
State of New York Department of Public
Service
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223

David Jones
Government and Industry Affairs
Committee
2120 L Street, NW Suite 810
Washington, DC 20037

Michael Hirsch
1200 19th Street, NW
Suite 607
Washington, DC 20036

David Hill
Audrey Rasmussen
O'Conner & Hannan
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006-3483

John Lane
Robert Gurss
Wikes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane, Chartered
1666 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Robert B. Kelly
Douglas Povich
Kelly, Hunter, Mow & Povich, P.C.
1133 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20036

Corwin Moore, Jr.
Personal Radio Steering Group
P.O. Box 2851
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Marjorie Esman
Hardy and Carey
111 Veterans Boulevard
Metairie, LA 70005

Shirley Fuji Moto
Brian Turner Ashby
Keller and Heckman
1001 G Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Kathy Shobert
Director of Federal Regulatory Affairs
888 16th Street, NW Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006


Nakia Marks